

DATE: October 18, 2021

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2109281

TO: Chairman Harry Johnston
ATTN TO: Margaret Stallings, Planning Manager
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed its regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI's relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This final report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the host local government.

Name of Proposal: Buice Lake South DRI #3403

Submitting Local Government: Cherokee County

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact **Date Opened:** Sep 28, 2021 **Date Closed:** Oct 18, 2021

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposal to build a mixed-use development on an approximately 59-acre site in Cherokee County just west of Bells Ferry Road and bounded by Buice Lake Parkway on the north, West Pine Ridge Drive on the south, and other development on the west. The plan of development includes 26 single family detached residential lots; 167 townhome units; 575 multifamily units; 18,500 s.f. of office space; and 24,000 s.f. of commercial space. Site access is proposed at five locations: two full access driveways on Buice Lake Pkwy.; a right-in/right-out driveway on Bells Ferry Rd.; a full access connection to Hunter Trail; and a full access connection to West Pine Ridge Dr. The nearest state route is SR 92, approximately 0.7 miles to the south via Bells Ferry Road. The local DRI trigger action is an application for approval of a Neighborhood Plan as part of Cherokee County's Bells Ferry Zoning Overlay. The expected buildout year is 2025. This DRI is a continuation/next phase of a previously reviewed DRI, #1811 (Mount Pilot).

FINDING:

Comments: According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI falls primarily in the Established Suburbs area, with a portion in the Bells Ferry Regional Center. The Plan details general information and policy recommendations for Established Suburbs and Regional Centers, which are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest certain aspects of regional policy, including some of those listed at the bottom of this narrative. The project proposes walkable residential development and park/open space amenities within sections of the Bells Ferry Livable Centers Initiative (LCI)/Community Design Guidelines area that are generally designated for a mix of high- and medium-density residential and park space. It is in relatively close proximity to a future planned mixed-use node at Bells Ferry Rd. and SR 92 (Alabama Road). The DRI also provides retail and office space fronting Bells Ferry Rd. at Buice Lake Parkway and along the planned Owl Creek Parkway at Hunter Trail, internal to the site. This arrangement will create the potential for some residents to work or shop on-site, which can reduce car trips.

To capitalize on the DRI's potential, County staff should ensure that the project supports its most current vision of this area, based on the Bells Ferry LCI plan and the County's resulting Community Design Guidelines.

Care should be taken to ensure that the development, as constructed, promotes an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths, entrances, and parking areas. To the maximum extent possible, new driveways and intersection corners where pedestrians will cross should be constructed with minimal curb radii to reduce speeds of turning vehicles and decrease crossing distances for pedestrians. Special consideration should be given to pedestrian routes connecting to the eastern edge of the development and across Bells Ferry Road at Hunter Trail and Buice Lake Parkway, which will allow the exclusively residential areas to the east to have pedestrian access to the DRI's retail component.

Some local destinations are potentially reachable by bicycle at present, and this DRI brings the potential to enhance bikeability in the area. It is noted in the DRI traffic impact study submitted to GRTA, that no external bicycle network along Bells Ferry Rd. currently exists. ARC's understanding is that areas noted on the submitted site plan along Bells Ferry Rd. as "Linear Park" are intended as space for a future multi-use path and high-quality streetscaping. No clear bicycle network is apparent within the project. The construction of the proposed Owl Creek and Buice Lake Parkways offers an ideal opportunity to include bicycle infrastructure on-site that can serve alternate transportation and recreational needs as well as connect to future bike facilities off-site.

The potential use of the areas marked Future Dev NG note should be clarified and will need to follow the guidance and recommendations provided for the balance of the project.

Additional transportation comments can be found in the attached comments from ARC's Transportation Access and Mobility Group.

The attached comments were also received from the Georgia Department of Transportation Aviation Division. They note that the project is outside any FAA approach and departure surfaces or airport compatible land use areas and that it does not appear to impact an airport. However, the project is in proximity to a navigation facility and may impact the assurance of navigation signal reception. As a result, studies will need to be undertaken to assess the impact of any building or crane taller than 100' above the

ground. The comments provide direction for completing and submitting the studies and details on how they will be evaluated by the FAA.

Much of the site currently has an extensive tree canopy, including several large natural/undisturbed areas. While a number of pocket parks and stormwater management areas, and some open space, have been designated on the plan, it is unclear if any of them will incorporate existing tree canopy or natural vegetation. The project would be substantially enhanced by the retention of some of the extensive existing tree canopy and natural vegetation. Open space areas with tree canopy can become a significant community amenity if connected by adjacent sidewalks to the larger sidewalk network. These areas can also retain some of the site's existing carbon storage/sequestration capacity and resulting positive effects on local air quality.

The project can further support regional planning goals by incorporating aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design, e.g., pervious pavers, rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc., throughout the site in general – especially in parking areas, on site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages.

ARC Natural Resources staff comments on water resources are attached. They indicate that no proposed impervious surfaces are shown intruding into State or County stream buffers. However, some of the project's townhomes appear to be close to the edge of the buffers. Any intrusion into the buffers may require variances.

The intensity and land use of this proposed project generally aligns with The Atlanta Region's Plan's recommendations for Established Suburbs and Regional Centers as well as the site's location in a developed area. However, it should be noted that this project is immediately adjacent to multiple existing residential neighborhoods and is a relatively short distance away from Cobb County to the south and the City of Woodstock to the east. County leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, must therefore collaborate to ensure absolute maximum sensitivity to nearby local governments, neighborhoods, land uses and natural resources.

As mentioned above, this project falls primarily in the Established Suburbs area, per ARC's UGPM. Established Suburbs are areas where suburban development has occurred. These areas are characterized by single-family subdivisions, commercial development, and office, industrial and multifamily development in limited locations. These areas represent the part of the region that has recently reached "build-out." With few remaining large parcels for additional development, these are the areas in which the region may see the least amount of land use change outside of retail and commercial areas.

While there is still room for limited infill development, these areas will begin to focus more on redevelopment over the next 30 years. Preservation of existing single-family neighborhoods is important, and wholesale change will most likely not occur in the single-family subdivisions that make up a majority of these areas. However, infill and redevelopment will occur in areas of retail/commercial concentrations, especially commercial corridors.

A portion of the DRI site is in a Regional Center per ARC’s UGPM. Regional Centers reflect concentrated uses that have generally defined boundaries. Regional Centers are areas of concentrated employment. People travel from around the region to these centers for employment, shopping, and entertainment. These centers should be connected to the regional transportation network with existing or planned high-capacity transit service. In most cases, these centers have a jobs–housing imbalance, so housing options should be expanded within their boundaries, especially around existing or planned transit.

Some Regional Centers could also be considered “Edge Cities,” developed in a suburban, auto-oriented way. They have limited multi-modal transportation options and are challenged by increasing congestion. Local plans and policies should support efforts to transform these areas into highly accessible mixed-use urban hubs. Some Regional Centers may have high concentrations of logistics or industrial uses. The retention of these uses is a key regional strategy. While some housing and other uses can be added, special attention should be given to reducing the impacts these will have on the existing logistics/industrial uses.

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY	ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS	ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	SRTA/GRTA
CHEROKEE COUNTY	COBB COUNTY	CITY OF ACWORTH
CITY OF WOODSTOCK	NORTHWEST GEORGIA REGIONAL COMMISSION	BARTOW COUNTY

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (470) 378-1645 or asmith@atlantaregional.org . This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews .



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)
[Tier Map](#)
[Apply](#)
[View Submissions](#)
[Login](#)

DRI #3403

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Initial DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Cherokee County

Individual completing form: Margaret Stallings

Telephone: 678-493-6106

E-mail: mstallings@cherokee.ga.gov

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Buice Lake South

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 21st District, Land Lots 1115, 1116 & 1118

Brief Description of Project: This mixed-use project consists of 575 Apartments, 167 Townhomes, 26 Single-family Detached Homes and 42,500 sqft of Commercial Space.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale & Distribution | <input type="radio"/> Attractions & Recreational Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal Terminals |
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools | <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 59.2 acres, 768 Residential Units + 42,500 sqft of Commercial Space

Developer: Lynwood Development

Mailing Address: 4880 Lower Roswell Road

Address 2: Suite 165, #524

City: Marietta State: GA Zip: 30068

Telephone: 404-512-4583

Email: wsnell@lynwooddevelopment.com

Is property owner different from developer/applicant? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, property owner:

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?

(not selected)

Yes

No

If yes, provide the following information:

Project Name: Mount Pilot
Project ID: 1811

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:

Rezoning

Variance

Sewer

Water

Permit

Other

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project?

(not selected)

Yes

No

If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent?

approx. 25% by acres and 43% of residential units

Estimated Project Completion Dates:

This project/phase: Sept. 2025
Overall project: Sept. 2025

Back to Top



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)
[Tier Map](#)
[Apply](#)
[View Submissions](#)
[Login](#)

DRI #3403

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the proposed DRI. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Cherokee County
Individual completing form: Margaret Stallings
Telephone: 678-493-6106
Email: mstallings@cherokee.ga.com

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Buice Lake South
DRI ID Number: 3403
Developer/Applicant: Lynwood Development
Telephone: 404-512-4583
Email(s): wsnell@lynwooddevelopment.com

Additional Information Requested

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$175 million

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$3 million

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Will this development displace any existing uses?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc):

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: Cherokee County Water and Sewerage Authority

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.18 (used 200 gallons/day/unit)

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

Is a water line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: Cherokee County Water & Sewerage Authority

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.162 (used 220 gallon/day/unit)

Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Land Transportation

How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) AM Peak hour: entering = 103, exiting = 228, total = 331; PM peak hour: entering 246, exiting:177, total 420

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe below: Recommendations for traffic improvements are included in the traffic study that will be included within the final DRI submission

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 1800 tons (used 12.123 lbs/day/unit)

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the

proposed development has been constructed?

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management:Storm water detention ponds and buffers will be provided per Cherokee County standards and other BMP's.

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

- 1. Water supply watersheds? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 3. Wetlands? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 4. Protected mountains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 5. Protected river corridors? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 6. Floodplains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 7. Historic resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- 8. Other environmentally sensitive resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:

[Back to Top](#)

Donald Shockey

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 8:49 AM
To: Donald Shockey
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Buice Lake South DRI #3403

Donald,

The planned development including 26 single family detached residential lots; 167 townhome units; 575 multifamily units; 18,500 s.f. of office space; and 24,000 s.f. of commercial space on an approximately 59-acre site in Cherokee County just west of Bells Ferry Road is 5.5 miles from the Cobb County International Airport (RYY). It is outside any FAA approach and departure surfaces, and is outside airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact an airport.

However, the proposed development is in proximity to a navigation facility and may impact the assurance of navigation signal reception, so studies are needed for any building or crane taller than 100' above the ground.. Those submissions to the FAA for the building and any associated cranes may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notifications, no later than 120 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impacts of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

Alan Hood

Airport Safety Data Program Manager



Aviation Programs

600 West Peachtree Street NW

6th Floor

Atlanta, GA, 30308

404.660.3394 cell

404.532.0082 office

From: Donald Shockey <DShockey@atlantaregional.org>

Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2021 4:38 PM

To: Margaret Stallings (mstallings@cherokeega.com) <mstallings@cherokeega.com>; Thomas E. Trawick <tetrawick@cherokeega.com>; mchapman@cherokeega.com; Brett Buchanan <bbuchanan@cherokeega.com>; bday@cherokeega.com; koconnor@woodstockga.gov; Jeff Moon <jmoon@woodstockga.gov>; Webb, David (Com Dev) <David.LWebb@cobbcounty.org>; jason.gaines@cobbcounty.org; john.pederson@cobbcounty.org; Jeannie Peyton - Cobb County (Jeannie.Peyton@cobbcounty.org) <Jeannie.Peyton@cobbcounty.org>; Laura Beall - Cobb County DOT (Laura.Beall@cobbcounty.org) <Laura.Beall@cobbcounty.org>; Diaz, Amy <amy.diaz@cobbcounty.org>; Christine Dobbs (cdobbs@acworth.org) <cdobbs@acworth.org>; Alex Almodovar <aalmodovar@acworth.org>; aluna@acworth.org; osborner@bartowcountygga.gov; olsonp@bartowcountygga.gov; sillst@bartowcountygga.gov; jmeadows@nwgrc.org; Tucker, Donovan <dtucker@dot.ga.gov>; Barry, Christina <cbarry@dot.ga.gov>; Waldrop, Grant <gWaldrop@dot.ga.gov>; Broyles, Christopher T <CBroyles@dot.ga.gov>; Hatch, Justin A <juhatch@dot.ga.gov>; Montefusco, Joshua M <JMontefusco@dot.ga.gov>; Kay, Linda M <LKay@dot.ga.gov>; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; 'cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov'; 'davinwilliams@dot.ga.gov'; Delgadillo Canizares, Marlene V. <mcanizares@dot.ga.gov>;

DeNard, Paul <pdenard@dot.ga.gov>; Finch, Ashley M <AFinch@dot.ga.gov>; Fowler, Matthew <mfowler@dot.ga.gov>; Kassa, Habte <hkassa@dot.ga.gov>; Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; Johnson, Lankston <lajohnson@dot.ga.gov>; Matthews, Timothy W <TMatthews@dot.ga.gov>; McLoyd, Johnathan G <JoMcLoyd@dot.ga.gov>; Mertz, Kaycee <kmertz@dot.ga.gov>; 'nrogers@dot.ga.gov'; Regis, Edlin <eregis@dot.ga.gov>; Robinson, Charles A. <chrobinson@dot.ga.gov>; Wilson, Megan R <MWilson@dot.ga.gov>; Woods, Chris N. <cwoods@dot.ga.gov>; chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us; nongame.review@dnr.ga.gov; kclark@gefa.ga.gov; gaswcc.swcd@gaswcc.ga.gov; Andrew Spiliotis <aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov>; Cain Williamson <cwilliamson@ATLtransit.ga.gov>; Annie Gillespie <agillespie@srta.ga.gov>; pmartin@srta.ga.gov; pemmanuel@srta.ga.gov; Jon West <jon.west@dca.ga.gov>; Zane Grennell <zane.grennell@dca.ga.gov>; wsnell@lynwooddevelopment.com; Abdul Amer <aamer@areng.com>; Naila Amer <namer@areng.com>; Naser Omer <nomer@areng.com>; Andra Taylordean <ataylordean@areng.com>; rhosack@tedecisions.com

Cc: Community Development <CommunityDevelopment@atlantaregional.org>; David Haynes <DHaynes@atlantaregional.org>; Jean Hee P. Barrett <JBarrett@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Santo <JSanto@atlantaregional.org>; Jim Skinner <JSkinner@atlantaregional.org>; Katie Perumbeti <KPerumbeti@atlantaregional.org>; Marquitrice Mangham <MMangham@atlantaregional.org>; Aries Little <ALittle@atlantaregional.org>; Mike Alexander <MAlexander@atlantaregional.org>; Mike Carnathan <MCarnathan@atlantaregional.org>; Patrick Bradshaw <PBradshaw@atlantaregional.org>; Wei Wang <WWang@atlantaregional.org>

Subject: ARC DRI Review Notification: Buice Lake South DRI #3403

Development of Regional Impact (DRI) – Request for Comments

This e-mail serves as notice that the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has begun a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of **Buice Lake South DRI #3403**.

Description:

A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposal to build a mixed-use development on an approximately 59-acre site in Cherokee County just west of Bells Ferry Road and bounded by Buice Lake Parkway on the north, West Pine Ridge Drive on the south, and other development on the west. The plan of development includes 26 single family detached residential lots; 167 townhome units; 575 multifamily units; 18,500 s.f. of office space; and 24,000 s.f. of commercial space. Site access is proposed at five locations: two full access driveways on Buice Lake Pkwy.; a right-in/right-out driveway on Bells Ferry Rd.; a full access connection to Hunter Trail; and a full access connection to West Pine Ridge Dr. The nearest state route is SR 92, approximately 0.7 miles to the south via Bells Ferry Road. The local DRI trigger action is an application for approval of a Neighborhood Plan as part of Cherokee County's Bells Ferry Zoning Overlay. The expected buildout year is 2025. This DRI is a continuation/next phase of a previously reviewed DRI, #1811 (Mount Pilot).

As a representative of a nearby local government or other potentially affected party, we request that you or your staff review the attached ARC Preliminary Report and provide ARC any comments on the DRI no later than **Wednesday, October 13, 2021**.

Comments should be emailed to Donald Shockey at dshockey@atlantaregional.org. You may also view the Report and other project information via the [ARC Plan Reviews webpage](#) beginning tomorrow by entering the project title in the search field. For more information regarding the DRI process, please visit the [ARC DRI webpage](#).

Georgia is a state of natural beauty. And it's a state that spends millions each year cleaning up litter that not only mars that beauty, but also affects road safety, the environment and the economy. Do your part – don't litter. How can you play an active role in protecting the splendor of the Peach State? Find out at <http://keepgaclean.com/>.

BUICE LAKE SOUTH DRI
Cherokee County
Natural Resources Group Comments
September 21, 2021

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Group has identified County and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

Watershed Protection

The project site is in the Allatoona Lake Watershed. As a US Army Corps of Engineers lake, Allatoona Lake is exempt from the Georgia DNR Part 5 Minimum Planning Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds.

Stream Buffers

Both the site plan and the USGS coverage for the project area show the headwaters of one blue line stream, Owl Creek, running along the western edge of the project property. The submitted site plan shows a stream with a short tributary on the eastern portion of the project property and a stream on the western side of the property. The site plan shows the 25-foot State Sediment and Erosion Control buffer as well as the Cherokee County Stream Buffer Ordinance's 50-foot stream buffer and 75-foot impervious setback. No impervious surfaces are shown intruding into any of the buffers. However, a few townhouses shown are close to the edge of the buffers. Any intrusion into the buffers may require variances. Any unmapped streams on the property may also be subject to the County stream buffer ordinance, and all waters of the state on the property are subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

Stormwater/Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality.

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (www.georgiastormwater.com) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3403
DRI Title Buice Lake South Mixed-Use Development
County Cherokee County
City (if applicable)
Address / Location Bells Ferry Road to the north and south of Hunter Trail and southwest of the intersection of Bells Ferry Road at Brice Lake Parkway

Proposed Development Type: It is proposed to develop 26 units of single family detached homes, 167 units of low-rise multifamily housing, 575 units of midrise multifamily housing, 18,500 SF of general office building space, and 24,000 SF of retail space.

Build Out: 2025

Review Process ☐ EXPEDITED
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Aries Little
Copied Marquitrice Mangham
Date September 23, 2021

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by A&R Engineering Inc.
Date September 20, 2021

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?

☐ YES *(provide the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)*

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

☒ NO *(provide comments below)*

There are no projects in the fiscally constrained RTP within the study area.

REGIONAL NETWORKS

02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☐ NO

☒ YES *(identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points)*

The project site will be served by SR 92, which is identified as a regional thoroughfare and accessed via Bells Ferry Road. Driveways 1, 3, and 10 are located on Bells Ferry Road.

03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☐ NO

☒ YES (*identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points*)

SR 92 is identified as a regional truck route which is accessed via Bells Ferry Road. There is a direct connection from SR 92 to I-575 and I-75. Driveways 1, 3, and 10 are located on Bells Ferry Road.

04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (*nearest station more than one mile away*)

☐ RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (*provide additional information below*)

Operator / Rail Line

Nearest Station

[Click here to enter name of operator and rail line](#)

Distance*

☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

- ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access*

- ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
- ☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
- ☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

Transit Connectivity

- ☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
- ☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
- ☐ No services available to rail station
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

* *Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site*

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
- ☒ NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
- ☐ YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
 - ☐ CST planned within TIP period
 - ☐ CST planned within first portion of long-range period
 - ☐ CST planned near end of plan horizon

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the connection a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

☐ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s) [Click here to enter name of operator\(s\).](#)

Bus Route(s) [Click here to enter bus route number\(s\).](#)

Distance* ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NO

☐ YES

Cherokee Area Transit (CATS) currently operates a Canton Fixed Route Service and a countywide Demand Response service.

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility

[Click here to provide name of facility.](#)

Distance

☐ Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity

- ☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
- ☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
- ☐ Not applicable (*accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed*)

* *Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site*

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (*connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development*)
- ☒ YES (*stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop*)
- ☐ NO (*the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop*)
- ☐ OTHER (*Please explain*)

On the most southern portion of the parcel, the site plan illustrates a stub out on the future Owl Creek Parkway, which is just south of the West Pine Ridge Dr and the future Owl Creek Parkway intersection.

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- ☒ YES (*sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network*)
- ☐ PARTIAL (*some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct*)
- ☐ NO (*walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent*)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (*the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips*)

☐ OTHER (Please explain)

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☒ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☐ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

It is referenced that the project's frontage will be constructed with pedestrian facilities. In addition to the frontage, sidewalks are proposed along the future Owl Creek Parkway which the site plan references future development along the road.

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

- ☐ YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- ☐ PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- ☐ NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)
- ☒ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?**

- ☐ UNKNOWN *(additional study is necessary)*
- ☒ YES *(based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)*
- ☐ NO *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

- 14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?**

- ☒ NO *(based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)*
- ☐ YES *(see comments below)*

Click here to enter text.

- 15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):**

